

1 Tanya E. Moore, SBN 206683
2 MOORE LAW FIRM, P.C.
3 300 South First Street, Ste. 342
4 San Jose, California 95113
Telephone (408) 298-2000
Facsimile (408) 298-6046
E-mail: service@moorelawfirm.com
tanya@moorelawfirm.com

5 Attorney for Plaintiff
6 Jose Escobedo

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

I. SUMMARY

21 1. This is a civil rights action by plaintiff JOSE ESCOBEDO (“Plaintiff”) for
22 discrimination at the building, structure, facility, complex, property, land, development, and/or
23 surrounding business complex known as:

Mariscos Costa Azul
3874 North Blackstone Avenue
Fresno, California 93726
(hereafter "the Facility")

27 2. Plaintiff seeks damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, attorney fees and costs,
28 against ELSA MARIA ZAMORANO dba MARISCOS COSTA AZUL, JOE GHAZALE, and

1 JOHN ROSS ABOU-GHAZALE (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants”), pursuant
2 to Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq.) (“ADA”)
3 and related California statutes.

4 **II. JURISDICTION**

5 1. This Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for ADA
6 claims.

7 2. Supplemental jurisdiction for claims brought under parallel California law –
8 arising from the same nucleus of operative facts – is predicated on 28 U.S.C. § 1337.

9 3. Plaintiff’s claims are authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

10 **III. VENUE**

11 4. All actions complained of herein take place within the jurisdiction of the United
12 States District Court, Eastern District of California, and venue is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
13 § 1331(b), (c).

14 **IV. PARTIES**

15 5. Defendants own, operate, and/or lease the Facility, and consist of a person (or
16 persons), firm, and/or corporation.

17 6. Plaintiff suffers from rheumatoid arthritis which impairs his ability to move his
18 joints without pain, is substantially limited in his ability to walk requiring a cane for mobility,
19 and has limited dexterity due to arthritis and finger amputation. Consequently, Plaintiff is
20 “physically disabled,” as defined by all applicable California and United States laws, and a
21 member of the public whose rights are protected by these laws.

22 **V. FACTS**

23 7. The Facility is a restaurant that is open to the public, it is intended for non-
24 residential use, and its operation affects commerce. The Facility is therefore a public
25 accommodation as defined by applicable state and federal laws.

26 8. Plaintiff lives less than five miles from the Facility and visited the Facility on or
27 about July 27, 2023 to dine at the restaurant. During his visit to the Facility, Plaintiff personally
28 encountered barriers (both physical and intangible) that interfered with, if not outright denied,

1 Plaintiff's ability to use and enjoy the goods, services, privileges and accommodations offered
2 at the Facility. These barriers include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

- 3 a) Plaintiff had difficulty locating the designated accessible parking in the
4 Facility's parking lot because it was not properly identified, lacking
5 proper pavement markings and signage.
- 6 b) The route of travel from the designated accessible parking stall to the
7 Facility entrance was cracked and uneven, with excessive slopes and
8 changes in level, which made it difficult and painful for Plaintiff to walk
9 across.
- 10 c) The Facility entrance lacked sufficient exterior maneuvering clearances
11 and the limited space provided was excessively sloped, which made it
12 difficult for Plaintiff to approach the door to open it.
- 13 d) The Facility entrance door was heavy and closed too quickly, making it
14 difficult for Plaintiff to open and walk through.
- 15 e) The locking mechanism on the men's restroom toilet compartment door
16 required tight pinching and grasping, which was difficult for Plaintiff to
17 use and caused pain in his hand.
- 18 f) Plaintiff wanted to sit at the bar dining counter, but the surface of the
19 counter was too high and the bar chairs were too high for him to hoist
20 himself onto. There was no lowered section of the bar counter, so Plaintiff
21 could not sit at the bar and had to sit at a standard table instead.

22 9. There may exist other barriers at the Facility which relate to Plaintiff's
23 disabilities, and he will seek to amend this Complaint once such additional barriers are identified
24 as it is Plaintiff's intention to have all barriers which exist at the Facility and relate to his
25 disabilities removed to afford him full and equal access.

26 10. Plaintiff was, and continues to be, deterred from visiting the Facility because
27 Plaintiff knows that the Facility's goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and
28 accommodations were and are unavailable to Plaintiff due to Plaintiff's physical disabilities.

1 Plaintiff enjoys the goods and services offered at the Facility, and will return to the Facility once
2 the barriers are removed.

3 11. Defendants knew, or should have known, that these elements and areas of the
4 Facility were inaccessible, violate state and federal law, and interfere with (or deny) access to
5 the physically disabled. Moreover, Defendants have the financial resources to remove these
6 barriers from the Facility (without much difficulty or expense), and make the Facility accessible
7 to the physically disabled. To date, however, Defendants refuse to either remove those barriers
8 or seek an unreasonable hardship exemption to excuse non-compliance.

9 12. At all relevant times, Defendants have possessed and enjoyed sufficient control
10 and authority to modify the Facility to remove impediments to wheelchair access and to comply
11 with the 1991 ADA Accessibility Guidelines and/or the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible
12 Design. Defendants have not removed such impediments and have not modified the Facility to
13 conform to accessibility standards. Defendants have intentionally maintained the Facility in its
14 current condition and have intentionally refrained from altering the Facility so that it complies
15 with the accessibility standards.

16 13. Plaintiff further alleges that the (continued) presence of barriers at the Facility is
17 so obvious as to establish Defendants' discriminatory intent. On information and belief, Plaintiff
18 avers that evidence of this discriminatory intent includes Defendants' refusal to adhere to
19 relevant building standards; disregard for the building plans and permits issued for the Facility;
20 conscientious decision to maintain the architectural layout (as it currently exists) at the Facility;
21 decision not to remove barriers from the Facility; and allowance that Defendants' property
22 continues to exist in its non-compliant state. Plaintiff further alleges, on information and belief,
23 that the Facility is not in the midst of a remodel, and that the barriers present at the Facility are
24 not isolated or temporary interruptions in access due to maintenance or repairs.

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

VI. FIRST CLAIM

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990

Denial of “Full and Equal” Enjoyment and Use

14. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in each of the foregoing paragraphs, and incorporates them herein as if separately re-pled.

15. Title III of the ADA holds as a “general rule” that no individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment (or use) of goods, services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations offered by any person who owns, operates, or leases a place of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

16. Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff by denying Plaintiff “full and equal enjoyment” and use of the goods, services, facilities, privileges and accommodations of the Facility during each visit and each incident of deterrence.

Failure to Remove Architectural Barriers in an Existing Facility

17. The ADA specifically prohibits failing to remove architectural barriers, which are structural in nature, in existing facilities where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

18. When an entity can demonstrate that removal of a barrier is not readily achievable, a failure to make goods, services, facilities, or accommodations available through alternative methods is also specifically prohibited if these methods are readily achievable. Id. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(v).

19. Here, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants can easily remove the architectural barriers at the Facility without much difficulty or expense, that the cost of removing the architectural barriers does not exceed the benefits under the particular circumstances, and that Defendants violated the ADA by failing to remove those barriers, when it was readily achievable to do so.

20. In the alternative, if it was not “readily achievable” for Defendants to remove the Facility’s barriers, then Defendants violated the ADA by failing to make the required services available through alternative methods, which are readily achievable.

11

Failure to Design and Construct an Accessible Facility

21. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Facility was designed and constructed (or both) after January 26, 1993 – independently triggering access requirements under Title III of the ADA.

22. The ADA also prohibits designing and constructing facilities for first occupancy after January 26, 1993, that aren't readily accessible to, and usable by, individuals with disabilities when it was structurally practicable to do so. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1).

23. Here, Defendants violated the ADA by designing and constructing (or both) the Facility in a manner that was not readily accessible to the physically disabled public – including Plaintiff – when it was structurally practical to do so.¹

Failure to Make an Altered Facility Accessible

24. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Facility was modified after January 26, 1993, independently triggering access requirements under the ADA.

25. The ADA also requires that facilities altered in a manner that affects (or could affect) its usability must be made readily accessible to individuals with disabilities to the maximum extent feasible. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2). Altering an area that contains a facility's primary function also requires making the paths of travel, bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving that area accessible to the maximum extent feasible. *Id.*

26. Here, Defendants altered the Facility in a manner that violated the ADA and was not readily accessible to the physically disabled public – including Plaintiff – to the maximum extent feasible.

Failure to Modify Existing Policies and Procedures

27. The ADA also requires reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter their nature. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

¹ Nothing within this Complaint should be construed as an allegation that Plaintiff is bringing this action as a private attorney general under either state or federal statutes.

1 28. Here, Defendants violated the ADA by failing to make reasonable modifications
2 in policies, practices, or procedures at the Facility, when these modifications were necessary to
3 afford (and would not fundamentally alter the nature of) these goods, services, facilities, or
4 accommodations.

Failure to Maintain Accessible Features

6 29. Defendants additionally violated the ADA by failing to maintain in operable
7 working condition those features of the Facility that are required to be readily accessible to and
8 usable by persons with disabilities.

9 30. Such failure by Defendants to maintain the Facility in an accessible condition was
10 not an isolated or temporary interruption in service or access due to maintenance or repairs.

11 31. Plaintiff seeks all relief available under the ADA (i.e., injunctive relief, attorney
12 fees, costs, legal expense) for these aforementioned violations. 42 U.S.C. § 12205.

13 32. Plaintiff seeks a finding from this Court (i.e., declaratory relief) that Defendants
14 violated the ADA in order to pursue damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act.

VII. SECOND CLAIM

Unruh Act

17 33. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in each
18 of the foregoing paragraphs, and incorporates them herein as if separately re-pled.

19 34. California Civil Code § 51 states, in part, that: All persons within the jurisdiction
20 of this state are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges,
21 or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.

35. California Civil Code § 51.5 also states, in part that: No business establishment
of any kind whatsoever shall discriminate against any person in this state because of the disability
of the person.

36. California Civil Code § 51(f) specifically incorporates (by reference) an
individual's rights under the ADA into the Unruh Act.

27 37. Defendants' aforementioned acts and omissions denied the physically disabled
28 public – including Plaintiff – full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges

1 and services in a business establishment (because of their physical disability).

2 38. These acts and omissions (including the ones that violate the ADA) denied, aided
3 or incited a denial, or discriminated against Plaintiff by violating the Unruh Act.

4 39. Plaintiff was damaged by Defendants' wrongful conduct, and seeks statutory
5 minimum damages of \$4,000 for each offense.

6 40. Plaintiff also seeks to enjoin Defendants from violating the Unruh Act (and
7 ADA), and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred under California Civil Code
8 § 52(a).

9 **VIII. THIRD CLAIM**

10 **Denial of Full and Equal Access to Public Facilities**

11 41. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in each
12 of the foregoing paragraphs, and incorporates them herein as if separately re-pled.

13 42. Health and Safety Code § 19955(a) states, in part, that: California public
14 accommodations or facilities (built with private funds) shall adhere to the provisions of
15 Government Code § 4450.

16 43. Health and Safety Code § 19959 states, in part, that: Every existing (non-exempt)
17 public accommodation constructed prior to July 1, 1970, which is altered or structurally repaired,
18 is required to comply with this chapter.

19 44. Plaintiff alleges the Facility is a public accommodation constructed, altered, or
20 repaired in a manner that violates Part 5.5 of the Health and Safety Code or Government Code
21 § 4450 (or both), and that the Facility was not exempt under Health and Safety Code § 19956.

22 45. Defendants' non-compliance with these requirements at the Facility aggrieved (or
23 potentially aggrieved) Plaintiff and other persons with physical disabilities. Accordingly,
24 Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and attorney fees pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 19953.

25 **IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

26 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, and each of them, for:

27 1. Injunctive relief, preventive relief, or any other relief the Court deems proper.

28 2. Statutory minimum damages under section 52(a) of the California Civil Code

1 according to proof.

2 3. Declaratory relief finding that Defendants violated the ADA for the purposes of
3 Unruh Act damages.
4 4. Attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit.²
5 5. Interest at the legal rate from the date of the filing of this action.
6 6. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

7
8 Dated: March 20, 2024

MOORE LAW FIRM, P.C.

9
10 /s/ Tanya E. Moore
11 Tanya E. Moore
12 Attorney for Plaintiff
Jose Escobedo
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

² This includes attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

1
2
3
VERIFICATION
4
5
6

I, JOSE ESCOBEDO, am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing Complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

I verify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: March 20, 2024

/s/ Jose Escobedo

Jose Escobedo

I attest that the original signature of the person whose electronic signature is shown above is maintained by me, and that his concurrence in the filing of this document and attribution of his signature was obtained.

/s/ Tanya E. Moore

Tanya E. Moore

Attorney for Plaintiff,
JOSE ESCOBEDO